

REMARKS

This paper responds to the restriction requirement mailed May 21, 2007.

The applicant elects Invention II, Species 1 with traverse. The claims reading on this elected invention/species combination are claims 1, 5-12, 15-20, 22, and 24-33.

The applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's requirement of restriction between the two alleged inventions, because independent claim 1 is admitted by the Examiner to be generic to both alleged *inventions* included in the restriction requirement. *See* Office Action at p. 2. In particular, the Examiner appears to simultaneously contend that claim 1 is directed to both "adaptive" and "non-adaptive" filtering methods, as well as both "variable" and "non-variable" filtering techniques. This can be true only in the sense that claim 1 is generic to all of these techniques. (The applicant also notes that the limitation of using a low pass filter is claimed in claim 13, which depends from claim 1, i.e. claim 1 is generic to low pass filtering, as well.) Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the requirement of restriction with respect to the alleged distinct inventions I and II, as asserted by the Examiner, and only require restriction among the asserted species 1 through 5.

If the Examiner's restriction requirement between the asserted inventions I and II is withdrawn, the claims reading solely on the elected species 1 are claims 1, 5-12, 15-20, 22, and 24-34, 38-41, 45, 46, 50, 51, and 53-60.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the applicant respectfully requests examination and allowance of claims 1-60.

Respectfully submitted,



Kurt Rohlf
Reg. No. 54,405
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631